

ADMINISTRATION TEAM MINUTES

Date: October 15, 2004
Time: 9:00 am
Place: Tacoma AGC Building

<u>Attending</u>	Mark Borton	<u>✓</u>	Tim Hayner	<u>✓</u>	Ken Olson	<u> </u>
	Jerry Brais	<u>✓</u>	Ann Hegstrom	<u>✓</u>	Mark Rohde	<u>✓</u>
	Forrest Dill	<u>✓</u>	Ron Howard	<u>✓</u>	Mark Scoccolo	<u> </u>
	Bob Glenn	<u> </u>	Dave Jones	<u>✓</u>	Dave Standahl	<u>✓</u>
	Paul Gonseth	<u>✓</u>	Tina Nelson	<u> </u>	Greg Waugh	<u>✓</u>
	Mike Hall	<u>✓</u>	Cathy Nicholas	<u>✓</u>	Tom Zamzow	<u>✓</u>

Opening Ron introduced Tim Hayner, from Tri-State, as a new member. He also noted that Tim, Mark Borton, Dave Standahl and Ken Olson have all been approved as members by the Lead Team.

The minutes of the September 17th meeting were approved.

Future Meetings were scheduled as follows:
Feb. 18th; Mar. 18th; and Apr. 15th.

Roundtable

Mark Rohde notes that CBI is working on jobs in Lewiston, Idaho (expansion joints) and in California near Lake Tahoe (polyester paving). He expects a quiet winter and hopes that WSDOT will have some of his kind of work next year.

Dave Jones described his visit to the Native American Tribal Council in Spokane this week. He says that a decision point is nearing on the Access spec (December, or April amendment). The Prompt Pay team has completed discussions and Dave needs to compose a report back to the Admin team.

Dave Standahl advises that his new job has consisted of constructability reviews and reviewing new projects. He listed a variety of work coming in the Seattle area, including big jobs for Sound Transit at Eastgate and Kirkland, widening I-5 from 175th to 205th, a new HOV job on I-5 south, the Sahalee project on SR 202 and the Jovita Boulevard job in the South End.

MINUTES (cont)

Date: October 15, 2004

Page 2

Roundtable (cont)

Ann Hegstrom has been working mostly on the big Sound Transit project at the new Maintenance Facility. Kiewit is working a joint venture with Atkinson on the Tukwila light rail project. They are doing okay elsewhere, but need more work in the Seattle area.

Mike Hall says that Goodfellow has been working on a project on the Snohomish that has been experiencing some major river flood stage fluctuations (5 feet in 3 hours.)

Paul Gonseth has been working on project closeout. He says that the bridge project in the Tri-Cities is plugging along. Superior assures us that the Vantage project on I-90 will be opened by Thanksgiving.

Tim Hayner says that Tri-State's big emphasis is at Sea-Tac on the third runway. They also have a big private job in Redmond. A variety of smaller WSDOT projects keeps them busy in their spare time.

Greg Waugh expects the LaGrande, Oregon project to finish up in November. Kuney is forming bridge decks in Spokane and continuing (thru next Spring) on the Portland job. They have submitted on a D-B project in Corvallis and are preparing a joint venture proposal for the Everett HOV.

Tom Zamzow notes that the noise walls at Lakeway in Bellingham should be done this winter. SR 20 will be opened enough for access to Diablo shortly. The job will be completed next Spring. They have new work for the Tulalip Tribe, a bridge on Lundeen Parkway, an extension of 41st Street in Everett (over a garbage dump that has experienced 15 feet of settlement), private developer work in Olympia and a tough new bridge job in Alaska.

Cathy Nicholas expects to have a new daughter by noon next Monday. She advises that Bush has signed the sixth extension of the Surface Transportation Act, through next May. Other legislation is addressing the tax on ethanol and the evasion of the Federal fuel tax. New rules could add \$4 Billion to the Trust Fund. Cathy has been working on a change order training class for Local Agencies.

Mark Borton says that Mowat is working on the joint venture proposal with Kuney for the Everett Design-Build job. They have three new jobs, one at Sea-Tac, one in the City of Renton and one in Mill Creek (as a sub). Most of their jobs are closing, with Mount Vernon's 2nd Street ongoing.

MINUTES (cont)

Date: October 15, 2004

Page 3

Roundtable (cont)

Jerry Brais noted Mark Scoccolo's absence and announced that SCI was second yesterday on a King County project. The County has little work until January, when the budget cycle will open on a number of bridge and intersection projects. He will be attending APWA next week in Kennewick.

Forrest Dill reported that Atkinson is working steadily on SR 18. The Bellevue Access project is a sprint to the finish and it looks like it will end up on the ambitious schedule. Congratulations came from around the table on the Bellevue work. On SR 18, they are dealing with silty native material and the discussions of usability and the effect on staging. The job is also investigating methods of stormwater treatment, with a decision needed soon before the winter storms are upon us. As to new work, the company is preparing proposals on most of the jobs already mentioned.

Ron Howard has been working on issue resolution for old jobs and spec review for new projects. He announced his retirement from the State, with the January meeting being his last.

New Business

Environmental Incentives

Ron announced that our team has been assigned a new task, to interrupt our work on schedules. The Lead Team has directed us to develop two new specifications for use on environmentally sensitive jobs. The first spec is intended to be a no-fault bonus for working without violations. The second is a bonus for working smart, environmentally. In addition, we are to provide the roadway team with suggestions for payment for an environmental expert advisor, to be provided by the Contractor, at the State's expense.

Performance Bonus

A Brainstorming Session yielded the following ideas, comments and concerns:

- The bonus should be large enough to be worthwhile, but not so large as to require the bidders to assume it will be earned in order to be competitive. Pursuit should be voluntary, with enough of a carrot to pay for extra efforts that might be made.
- In addition to or instead of a bonus, the answer lies in the people involved. If there is a collaborative effort, there will be better results.
- Violations will be the measure and they will be controlled by a third party not involved in the contract. There needs to be an appeal process to excuse violations that are not appropriate.

MINUTES (cont)

Date: October 15, 2004

Page 4

New Business

Environmental Incentives (cont)

- Use of a bonus is problematic because some WSDOT people try to avoid paying bonuses, seeing them as windfalls for the Contractor.
- The risk of incurring violations needs to be controlled by the entity who is pursuing the bonus.
- There must be objective criteria leading to a violation or the Contractor will be unable to control the chances of getting one.
- Different people (regulatory agency people) interpret the same provisions differently.
- The Contractor could look at this the same way he sees his safety program. Where he does job hazard evaluation in safety, he could do an environmental hazard evaluation for this bonus. The same outcome (\$) with the same problems (employees have accidents, often beyond the Contractor's control).
- There would have to be a person advising the Contractor and crew about environmental issues.
- The Contractor would need assurance that the DOT would help in the Contractor's efforts to avoid violations. For example, when the Contractor wants to deal with the regulating agency, the State would have to set up the three-way meeting.
- With this provision, the Contractor would pay attention to BMP's and set them up as soon as possible.
- If DOE had a consulting arm, similar to WISHA, the Contractor could discover the perceived problems and address them before they become a violation.
- Back to the safety model, the bonus could be graduated. One month with no violations = 10%, Two months = 15% more, etc. One violation and start over at 10%.
- Spec should motivate getting information to the lowest levels—people who actually create the violations.
- Separate payment for big items (stormwater treatment, storage vaults, etc). Too much risk to leave this investment in the possible incentive and the price will go sky-high.
- Avoid bid items and use force account for pollution control. Do we really want the low bid here?
- Could specify regular meetings with owner and regulator.
- Payments should be periodic and not kept for one gasp.

MINUTES (cont)

Date: October 15, 2004

Page 5

New Business

Environmental Incentives (cont)

Performance Bonus

- Some kind of project site review will be needed. Should be random.
- The review should be done by WSDOT, not by the regulator.
- The review should be based on known standards (pre-bid).
- If a problem is repaired quickly after identification, there should be a partial credit.
- Criteria must be objective, yes-no evaluations without subjective judgment.
- A checklist should be included in the bid documents. Should be project-specific
- Allow points instead of percentages. Set up different point categories for different types of work going on.
- Criteria for similar work should be similar job-to-job. Could use weighting for emphasis depending on job-specific needs.
- Consider different items for different operations
- The amount of the bonus should vary with the type of job, not with the bid value.
- The bonus item cannot be sublet (especially as a condition of award.)

Payment for Environmental Technical Advisor

- Force Account
- Consider a service under 1-09.6 (Invoice plus 21%)
- Selection: Arbitration model (State provides 3 names, Contractor picks one or submits three more, etc).
- If the advisor was a company, there would be backup for absences.

Old Business

Progress Schedules

Paul Gonseth presented the revision to the simple bar graph presentation that was agreed upon last month. The team agreed to accept Paul's latest version (copy attached). As before, this acceptance is conditional. When we have all the schedule specs, we'll need to assure that there are no conflicts and no gaps.

MINUTES (cont)

Date: October 15, 2004

Page 6

Old Business

Progress Schedules (cont)

Forrest Dill led a discussion of the needs for a complex schedule GSP. This would be a more complicated and demanding piece of work. It would need more detail in the spec and would likely want to have a pay item. It will only be used when the job demands it. The team offered comments:

- Both DOT and the Contractor will need staff to properly manage with such a spec.
- There should be some kind of resubmittal schedule, rather than the standard “when necessary” language.
- A pay item, maybe Lump Sum or per update, would be appropriate.
- The spec should reflect the team’s original goals for the purpose of a schedule. It is not to be defined as a claim-defense tool, but rather as a tool for the State to assure that the work is planned to be done in the contract time, to allow the State to marshal resources, to allow the State to monitor progress and to allow the State to predict outcomes for PR purposes.

Future Meetings

November 12th, 2004 @ Tacoma AGC (9:00 am)

January 14th, 2005 @ Tacoma AGC--Boardroom (9:00 am)

February 18th, 2005 @ Location to be Determined

March 18th, 2005 @ Location to be Determined

April 15th, 2005 @ Location to be Determined

Assignment List

<u>Who</u>	<u>What</u>	<u>By When</u>
Sponsors	Prepare to Lead Team thru Subject Area	Nov 12 th
All members	Provide Input to Sponsors	ASAP

MINUTES (cont)

Date: October 15, 2004

Page 7

Team's "Round Tuit" List

1. Traffic Control Provisions
2. Progress Schedules
 - Short-term Scheduling
 - Section 1-08.8, p5.c—Extensions for Quantity Overruns?
3. Re-visit NCHRP 350 and Standard Specifications of Traffic Signs
4. Insurance Cost/ Reimbursement
5. Tort Claims Liability/Accident Reports
6. Bid Item for On-site Overhead
7. Disputes Review Boards
8. Joint Training—Documentation
9. Payroll, Wage Administration procedures
10. Materials on Hand provisions
11. Web-Based Construction Management

Attachments

Accepted 1-08.3(alt) Bar Chart Spec

General Special Provision (GSP)

Allow Bar Graph Schedule on simpler jobs.

(Instructions to Designers)

At the discretion of the Region Administrator (?), use on less complex projects (those with few concurrent activities that are critical to subsequent activities) where progress schedules may be submitted using bar graph or similar type methods.

(New Date)

Progress Schedule

The first and second paragraphs of Section 1-08.3 are revised to read as follows:

The Contractor shall submit a progress schedule to the Project Engineer no later than the first working day as defined in Section 1-08.5. This schedule and any replacement schedule shall show physical completion of all work within the specified contract time and shall show the planned order of work, which shall correspond to any order of work requirements included in the contract documents. The schedule shall be developed by a critical path, bar graph, or similar type method. Durations shall be in working days as defined in Section 1-08.5 or as modified in the Special Provisions. The schedule shall display all activities necessary to complete the work. Activities shall be defined in small enough durations that the work can be described in recognizable detail. The individual activity durations shall be reasonable for the included work. The inter-relationship of all activities shall be shown in a logical sequence.